



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,579	08/17/2001	Raymond C. Chen	103.1073.01	5199

22883 7590 02/26/2004
SWERNOFSKY LAW GROUP PC
P.O. BOX 390013
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94039-0013

EXAMINER

WONG, LESLIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

8

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/932,579

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Leslie Wong

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/19Sept2001. ✓
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. The Applicants' claim to domestic priority under 35 U.S.C § 120, as a Continuation-in-Part (CIP) of application 09/642,066, filed 18 August 2000, is acknowledged.

As a result, a priority date of no later than 17 August 2001 (the filing date of the CIP application) is established, and depending upon the specific subject matter claimed, the priority date could be as early as 18 August 2000.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it **exceeds 150 words** limit. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 15-19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Dunham** (U.S. Patent 6,269,431).

Regarding claim 15, **Dunham** teaches a method of operating a filesystem, said filesystem including a live filesystem accessible to users and a zombie filesystem not accessible to users, said method including dynamically growing said zombie filesystem (col. 13, lines 1-11).

Regarding claims 16, 17, 19, and 22, **Dunham** further teaches the steps of:

- a). a deletion operation on a file in said live filesystem, allocating storage within said zombie filesystem for metadata associated with said file (col. 14, lines 43-49);
- b). performing said dynamic growth in response to failure of said allocation

Art Unit: 2177

of storage (col.13, lines 1-11);

c). re-performing said allocation of storage after said dynamic growth (col. 13, lines 1-11); and

d). transferring said file from said live filesystem to said zombie filesystem (col. 14, lines 43-49).

Regarding claims 18 and 21, **Dunham** further teaches a method of operating a filesystem, said filesystem including a live filesystem accessible to users and a zombie filesystem not accessible to users, said method including transfer of a file to said zombie filesystem before breakage of links to blocks in said file, in response to an operation on said file, said operation using said zombie filesystem (col. 14, lines 43-49).

7. Claims 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Kleiman** (U.S. Patent 6,317,844 B1).

Regarding claims 24 and 27, **Kleiman** teaches a method of operating a filesystem, said filesystem including a live filesystem accessible to users and a zombie filesystem not accessible to users, said method including replay of an operation on a file, said operation using said zombie filesystem (col. 3, lines 34-51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 1, 3, 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lam** (U.S. Patent 5,564,037A) in view of **Kleiman** (U.S. Patent 6,317,844B1).

Regarding claim 1, **Lam** teaches a method of operating a filesystem, said filesystem including a live filesystem (i.e., file server 10 in Fig. 1) accessible to users and a zombie filesystem (i.e., secondary storage) not accessible to users (Fig. 1, element 20).

Although the prior art does not explicitly indicate that the secondary storage is not accessible to users, but it should be understood that **Lam's** system utilizes the secondary storage for internal file manipulations and therefore, it is apparent that the users are not allow to access this storage element.

Lam does not explicitly teach the method including recording changes to said zombie filesystem in a persistent memory.

Kleiman, however, teaches recording changes to said filesystem in a persistent memory (col. 3, lines 34-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Kleiman's** teaching would have allowed **Lam's** to quickly recover from failure of any storage element and keep the system continued available as it implements frequent and rapid checkpoints among its storage element and rapidly distributes duplicate commands for those operations between checkpoints among its storage elements (col. 1, lines 54-63).

Regarding claim 3, **Lam** further teaches a truncation operation on a file in live filesystem comprising the steps of:

- a). a truncation operation on a file in said live filesystem, transferring at least a portion of said file from said live filesystem to said zombie filesystem (col. 6, lines 16-25);
- b). breaking links associating disk blocks with said file in a plurality of steps while a portion of said file is associated with said zombie filesystem (col. lines 28-31),
- c). altering said live filesystem to reflect changes associated with said breaking of links (col. 6, lines 31-45).

Lam does not explicitly teach wherein said recording of changes includes recording said breaking of links in a plurality of steps.

Kleiman, however, teaches wherein said recording of changes includes recording said breaking of links in a plurality of steps (col. 3, lines 34-42).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, **Kleiman** further teaches an operation performed using said zombie filesystem, checkpointing said filesystem during performance of said operation (abstract).

Regarding claims 9-11, **Kleiman** further teaches replaying a set of said changes in response to said record (col. 3, lines 34-51).

Regarding claims 12-14, **Kleiman** further teaches wherein said persistent memory includes a log of substantially all changes, within a selected time duration, to either said live filesystem or said zombie filesystem (col. 2, lines 2-13 and abstract).

9. Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lam** (U.S. Patent 5,564,037) and **Kleiman** (U.S. Patent 6,317,844 B1) as applied to claims 1, 3, 7-14 above and further in view of **Dunham** (U.S. Patent 6,269,431).

Regarding claim 2, **Lam** teaches a deletion operation on a file in livespace comprising the steps of:

- b). breaking links associating disk blocks with said file in a plurality of steps while said file is associated with said zombie filesystem (col. lines 28-31).
- c). altering said live filesystem to reflect said operation (col. 6, lines 31-45).

Kleiman teaches recording of changes includes recording said breaking of links in a plurality of steps (col. 3, lines 34-42).

Lam and **Kleiman** does not explicitly teach the steps of:

- a). deletion operation on a file in said live filesystem, transferring said file from said live filesystem to said zombie filesystem ;

Dunham, however, teaches the deletion operation on a file in said live filesystem, transferring said file from said live filesystem to said zombie filesystem (col. 14, lines 43-50).

Art Unit: 2177

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Dunham's** teaching would have allowed **Lam** and **Kleiman's** to enhance the system performance of the primary filespace by carrying out a delete file operation command in another filespace.

Regarding claim 6, **Lam** further teaches an operation performed using said zombie filespace as discussed in claim 1.

Lam and **Kleiman** does not explicitly teach altering a size of said zombie filespace during performance of said operation.

Dunham, however, teaches altering a size of said filespace during performance of said operation (col. 13, lines 1-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Dunham's** teaching would have allowed **Lam** and **Kleiman's** to adjust the filespace in accordance with the need of the system in order to accommodate the requests.

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lam** (U.S. Patent 5,564,037) and **Kleiman** (U.S. Patent 6,317,844 B1) as applied to claims 1, 3, 7-14 above and further in view of **Jacobs et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,334,114 B1).

Regarding claim 4, **Lam** and **Kleiman** teach for an operation apparent to users as substantially atomic, performing said operation in a plurality of steps using said zombie filespace, wherein said recording changes is performed in said persistent memory for each of said plurality of steps as discuss above in claims 1-3.

Lam and **Kleiman** does not explicitly teach performing file operations and recording changes apparent to users are substantially atomic.

Jacobs et al., however, teaches performing file operations and recording changes apparent to users are substantially atomic (col. 20, lines 16-21 and col. 27, lines 42-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Jacobs's** teaching would have allowed **Lam** and **Kleiman's** to protect the integrity of data and also satisfy the fundamental requirement for data security.

11. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lam** (U.S. Patent 5,564,037) and **Kleiman** (U.S. Patent 6,317,844 B1) as applied to claims 1, 3, 7-14 above and further in view of **Dunham** (U.S. Patent 6,269,431) and **Cannon** (U.S. Patent 6,041,334).

Regarding claim 5, **Lam** and **Kleiman** do not explicitly teach an operation performed on a to file having attached data elements, performing said operation using said zombie filespace.

Art Unit: 2177

Dunham, however, teaches performing the deletion operation on a file in the zombie filesystem (col. 14, lines 43-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Dunham's** teaching would have allowed **Lam** and **Kleiman's** to enhance the system performance of the primary filesystem by carrying out a delete file operation command in another filesystem.

Lam, **Kleiman**, and **Dunham** do not teach wherein an operation performed on a file having attached data elements.

Cannon, however, teaches a step wherein an operation performed on a file having attached data elements (col. 2, lines 34-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Cannon's** teaching would have allowed **Lam**, **Kleiman**, and **Dunham's** to facilitate file management with reduced overhead by grouping smaller files into larger aggregate files.

12. Claims 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dunham** (U.S. Patent 6,269,431) as applied to claims 15-19, 21, and 22 above and further in view of **Lam** (U.S. Patent 5,564,037) and **Kleiman** (U.S. Patent 6,317,844 B1).

Art Unit: 2177

Regarding claims 20 and 23, **Dunham** does not explicitly teach a **truncation** operation on a file in said live filesystem, said transfer includes

- a). creating a link associating at least a portion of said file with said zombie filesystem; and
- b). breaking a link associating said portion with said file in said live filesystem; and said truncation operation includes breaking links associating disk blocks with said file in a plurality of steps while a portion of said file is associated with said zombie filesystem, wherein said recording of changes includes recording said breaking of links in a plurality of steps; and

- c). altering said live filesystem to reflect changes associated with said breaking of links.

Lam further teaches the steps of:

- a). a truncation operation on a file in said live filesystem, transferring at least a portion of said file from said live filesystem to said zombie filesystem (col. 6, lines 16-25);

- b). breaking links associating disk blocks with said file in a plurality of steps while a portion of said file is associated with said zombie filesystem (col. lines 28-31),

- c). altering said live filesystem to reflect changes associated with said breaking of links (col. 6, lines 31-45).

Lam does not explicitly teach wherein said recording of changes includes recording said breaking of links in a plurality of steps.

Kleiman, however, teaches wherein said recording of changes includes recording said breaking of links in a plurality of steps (col. 3, lines 34-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Kleiman's** teaching would have allowed **Lam** and **Dunham's** to quickly recover from failure of any storage element and keep the system continued available as it implements frequent and rapid checkpoints among its storage element and rapidly distributes duplicate commands for those operations between checkpoints among its storage elements (col. 1, lines 54-63).

13. Claims 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kleiman** (U.S. Patent 6,317,844 B1) as applied to claims 24 and 27 above and further in view of **Dunham** (U.S. Patent 6,269,431) and **Lam** (U.S. Patent 5,564,037).

Regarding claims 25 and 28, **Kleiman** teaches wherein replay is responsive to a set of recorded changes in persistent memory (col. 3, lines 34-42).

Kleiman does not explicitly teach the steps of:

- a). deletion operation on a file in said live filespace, transferring said file from said live filespace to said zombie filespace.
- b). breaking links associating disk blocks with said file in a plurality of steps while said file is associated with said zombie filespace, and recording said breaking of links in said persistent memory in a plurality of steps; and

Art Unit: 2177

- c). altering said live filesystem to reflect said deletion operation, and recording said alteration in said persistent memory.

Dunham, however, teaches the steps of:

- a). deletion operation on a file in said live filesystem, transferring said file from said live filesystem to said zombie filesystem (col. 14, lines 43-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Dunham's** teaching would have allowed **Kleiman's** to enhance the system performance of the primary filesystem by carrying out a delete file operation command in another filesystem.

Kleiman and **Dunham** do not explicitly teach the steps of:

- b). breaking links associating disk blocks with said file in a plurality of steps while a portion of said file is associated with said zombie filesystem.
- c). altering said live filesystem to reflect changes associated with said breaking of links.

Lam, however, teaches the steps of:

- b). breaking links associating disk blocks with said file in a plurality of steps while a portion of said file is associated with said zombie filesystem (col. lines 28-31).
- c). altering said live filesystem to reflect changes associated with said

Art Unit: 2177

breaking of links (col. 6, lines 31-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Lam's** teaching would have allowed **Kleiman** and **Dunham's** to enable users to access to deleted files.

13. Claims 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kleiman** (U.S. Patent 6,317,844 B1) as applied to claims 24 and 27 above and further in view of **Lam** (U.S. Patent 5,564,037).

Regarding claims 26 and 29, **Kleiman**, teaches wherein said recording of changes includes recording said breaking of links in a plurality of steps (col. 3, lines 34-42).

Kleiman does not explicitly teach the steps of:

- a). a truncation operation on a file in said live filesystem, transferring at least a portion of said file from said live filesystem to said zombie filesystem.
- b). breaking links associating disk blocks with said file in a plurality of steps while a portion of said file is associated with said zombie filesystem.
- c). altering said live filesystem to reflect changes associated with said breaking of links.

Lam, however, teaches a truncation operation on a file in live filesystem comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2177

- a). a truncation operation on a file in said live filesystem, transferring at least a portion of said file from said live filesystem to said zombie filesystem (col. 6, lines 16-25);
- b). breaking links associating disk blocks with said file in a plurality of steps while a portion of said file is associated with said zombie filesystem (col. lines 28-31),
- c). altering said live filesystem to reflect changes associated with said breaking of links (col. 6, lines 31-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Lam's** teaching would have allowed **Kleiman's** to enhance the system performance by reducing the processing load on the primary storage (col. 5, lines 20-26).

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gainer et al. (US006321219B1)

Humlicek et al. (US006594744B1)

Zayas et al. (US006560615B1)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (703) 305-3018. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2177


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Leslie Wong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2177

Lw
21 February 2004



JACK CHOULES
PRIMARY EXAMINER